

Comment on the citation of names in *Zoological Record* as evidence of general scientific use

M. Joan Thorne

Editorial Manager, Biosis U.K., Garforth House, 54 Micklegate, York YO1 1LF, U.K.

In a comment (BZN 48: 148–150) on the proposed precedence of the fish family name HOMALOPTERIDAE over BALITORIDAE, Drs P.K.L. Ng & K.K.P. Lim have discussed the usage of those names. They are apparently using (p. 149) the number of occurrences of HOMALOPTERIDAE in *Zoological Record* to support the view that this family name does not have wide scientific usage. However, because of our policy of standardizing the classification and placement of names this argument is not necessarily valid.

Classification for the *Record* consists of placing the name(s) used in an article under the appropriate *Zoological Record* controlled vocabulary heading. Wherever possible our headings are based on generally accepted published authorities, or on internal records compiled over a number of years. Thus the heading names in the *Record* might, or might not, be the classification given in the article. This policy makes information retrieval very straightforward: users have to look in only one place to find all entries for a particular name. However, the placement does not simply reflect what has been used in the literature. This matter is something which we would like to resolve for the future, but consistent retrieval is our first priority.

As a matter of interest, following revision of our controlled vocabulary for *Zoological Record* (vol. 128) we base the classification of fishes on Eschmeyer's *Catalog of the Genera of Recent Fishes* (California Academy of Sciences, 1990).

Comment on the proposal to remove the homonymy between CLAVIDAE McCrady, 1859 (Cnidaria, Hydrozoa) and CLAVINAE Casey, 1904 (Mollusca, Gastropoda) (Case 2710; see BZN 48: 192–195)

Donn L. Tippet

Division of Mollusks, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.

I write to point out that there is no need to make available the name CLAVUSINAE for the gastropod subfamily previously known as CLAVINAE and more recently as DRILLINAE; the latter name should continue in use for the group, in accordance with Article 60 of the Code.

That the name CLAVINAE Casey, 1904 cannot be used is unfortunate since modern workers have become used to it, but there can be no question about its impropriety, as explained in the application. However, the next available name, DRILLINAE Olsson, 1964, is certainly a satisfactory alternative: it unambiguously represents the same group of species and, since Cernohorsky (1985) adopted the name, it has come into common usage (see, for example, Vaught, 1989, p. 57).

It appears that the only significant hesitation in adopting the name DRILLINAE is contained in the statement 'although DRILLINAE is at present considered to be a synonym of CLAVINAE, future research may prove the two groups to be biologically

and taxonomically distinct' (para. 6 of the application). This is, in fact, very unlikely. The type genera, *Clavus* Montfort, 1810 and *Drillia* Gray, 1838 (p. 28), of the two nominal subfamilies have type species (*Clavus flammulatus* Montfort, 1810 and *Drillia umbilicata* Gray, 1838 respectively) which are similar and differentiable at the generic level only. Not only are their shells alike but their radular structure is of the same type (the latter is common to all the species in this grouping as now understood). In addition, although there is little available anatomical data, in those cases where it is known there is a very similar poison gland and bulb. Thus, although future research might well demonstrate differences, there is little to suggest the likelihood of there being two significantly different groups, at least at the subfamily level. It may also be noted that in the older literature, such as H. & A. Adams (1853), the taxa concerned were often included in the one genus *Drillia*.

To make the name CLAVUSINAE available would be an artificial solution to the homonymy problem (if in fact there is a problem) and could itself be a cause of instability. I therefore oppose the application.

Additional references

Adams, H. & A. 1853. *The genera of Recent Mollusca*, vol. 1, part 3. Pp. 65–96. Van Voorst, London.

Gray, J.E. 1838. On some new species of quadrupeds and shells. *Annals of Natural History; or, Magazine of Zoology, Botany, and Geology*, 1(1): 27–30.

Comment on the proposed attribution of the specific name of *Ceratites nodosus* to Schlotheim, 1813, and the proposed designation of a lectotype (Cephalopoda, Ammonoidea)

(Case 2732; see BZN 48: 31–35, 246)

E.T. Tozer

Geological Survey of Canada, 100 West Pender Street, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, V6B 1R8

1. Ulrich's proposal (BZN 48: 33, 34) is to attribute the specific name of *Ammonites nodosa* to Schlotheim, 1813, rather than to Bruguière, 1789, and to accept *Ammonites nodosa* Schlotheim, 1813 as the type species of *Ceratites* de Haan, 1825. I consider these proposals to be unnecessary and undesirable, particularly since the original specimen of *Ammonites nodosa* Bruguière has been discovered and proposed as lectotype. I therefore now propose to the Commission that this original specimen be confirmed as the lectotype. In the following paragraphs I spell out in some detail the history of this important case.

2. *Ammonites nodosa* Bruguière, 1789 (p. 43) is based on an illustration (pl. 39, no. 262) in an anonymous work published simultaneously in Paris and The Hague in 1742. The Paris edition is entitled *Traité des Pétifications* and the Hague edition *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire Naturelle des Pétifications dans les quatre parties du Monde*. Apart from the title pages the books are the same. The author is disguised as 'B***'. These works are attributed to Louis Bourguet (1678–1742). He interpreted the